00002664 7

CORRES. CONTROL
OUTGOING LTR NO.

OE ORDER# 4700.1

94 RF 09466

EG&G ROCKY FLATS

EG&G ROCKY FLATS, INC.
ROCKY FLATS PLANT, P.O. BOX 464, GOLDEN, COLORADO 80402-0464 • (303) 966-7000

DIST.	LTR	ENC
MARAL, M.E.		
URLINGAME, A.H.		
USBY, W.S.		
RANCH, D.B.		
ARNIVAL, G.J.		
AVIS, J.G.		
ERRERA, D.W.		
RAY, R.E.		
EIS, J.A.		
LOVER, W.S.		
OLAN, P.M.		
ANNI, B.J.		
ARMAN, L.K.		
EALY, T.J.		
EDAHL, T.		
ILBIG, J.G.		
UTCHINS, N.M.		
ACKSON, D.T.		
ELL, R.E.		
UESTER, A.W.		
ARX, G.E.		
cDONALD, M.M.		
cKENNA, F.G.		
ONTROSE, J.K.		
ORGAN, R.V.		
OTTER, G.L.		
IZZUTO, V.M.		
ISING, T.L.		
ANDLIN, N.B.		
CHWARTZ, J.K.		
ETLOCK, G.H.		
TEWART, D.L.		
TIGER, S.G.		
OBIN, P.M.		
OORHEIS, G.M.		
ILSON, J.M.		
LOEGRO, JA	X	X
LONDON, KC	X	X
AUSTIN, MS	X	X
BECKMAN, TD	X	X
COLLINS, CA	X	X
MELLEN, JB	X	X
F, TC	X	X
ORRES. CONTROL	X	X
DMN RECORD/0802		
RAFFIC		
ATS/T130G		

LASSIFICATION:

CNI		
NCLASSIFIED		
ONFIDENTIAL		
ECRET		

UTHORIZED CLASSIFIER
SIGNATURE

ATE

REPLY TO RFP CC NO:

CTION ITEM STATUS
PARTIAL/OPEN
CLOSED
R APPROVALS:

RIG & TYPIST INITIALS
CLH

Rev. 6/94)

September 13, 1994

94-RF-09466

F. R. Lockhart
Environmental Restoration Division
DOE, RFFO

MEETING MINUTES FROM AUGUST 31, 1994 - SRK-193-94

Action: None required

Attached are the meeting minutes from August 31, 1994, at which numerous decisions were made.

Please call me with any questions, on extension 8541.

S. R. Keith
Program Manager
Solar Pond Projects

SRK:clh

Orig. and 1 cc - F. R. Lockhart

S. Howard - DOE, RFFO
M.A. Witherill - " "

ADMIN RECORD

I101-A-000106

SOLAR POND PROJECTS

MINUTES FROM JOINT STAFF MEETING ON 8/31/94

ATTENDEES:

EG&G	DOE-RFFO
M Austin	S Howard
T d Beckman	F R Lockhart
L A Collins	S R Surovchak
S R Keith	
J A Ledford	
K C London	

I. MINIMALLY TREATED SLUDGE ALTERNATIVES

Various different methods of meeting the current waste acceptance criteria were discussed and agreement was reached on which method to adopt. Basic three methods were: (1) mix the sludge and water with soil from the excavation such that all water is taken up by the soil as moisture content, (2) mix the sludge and water with flyash, lime, and other additives to chemically bind the free liquid, then introduce soil so the mixture is still workable during compaction, (3) do a full cementation with pelletizing to produce full LDR compliant pellets.

Method (1) has several drawbacks. The liquid would not be chemically bound and would enter the environment eventually as some precipitation moves through the cap (no cap is 100% tight). That creates a potential problem in public and regulator acceptance. A second drawback is that during construction of the remediation a risk of heavy rains washing this liquid into the surrounding environment would exist, even though precautions would be in place during construction to prevent this from happening. The benefits of this approach are lowest estimated cost and minimal volumes of disposal wastes.

Method (2) also has several drawbacks. Costs would be higher than (1), the magnitude at this date being unknown but ballparked at perhaps several millions of dollars. Volume of wastes to be disposed in the remediation would also grow roughly by 50%. The main benefit of this approach is that the liquids would be chemically bound and thus unable to threaten the environment. The public and regulator acceptance would therefore be enhanced. Also, this type of treatment would not set a precedent of meeting LDR requirements. Doing so might raise the question of why the contaminated soil media is not also treated to meet LDR requirements.

Method (3) has some serious drawbacks. The costs would be substantially higher than either (1) or (2). It would be an overkill method of meeting the currently established waste acceptance criteria. This method would also raise the question of why not treat all wastes to be left in place to LDR compliant levels. At the meeting, DOE-RFFO agreed that the EG&G recommendation of following method (2) is appropriate based upon information known today.

II. REMIX PONDCRETE BASELINE CURRENTLY UNAFFECTED?

F Lockhart shared that DOE is very serious on disposing the inventory pondcrete in the remediation, similarly to the pond sludge. He stated that now is the right time to rebaseline the solar ponds program to include this disposition of the inventoried pondcrete. EG&G stated that, given the late date, it would be difficult to effect this change in scope for the FY '95 budget call but that it is preferable to do so rather than expend energies defending a scope which is not being followed and then do the BCP early '95. EG&G stated that they would discuss whether or not to rescope for FY '95 budget call or wait for a BCP. The decision has been subsequently made to rescope for the 95 budget call, knowing full well that the quality of affected work packages may suffer.

The effect on the current remix treatability was discussed. If the saltcrete LDR certification is successful, which is expected, and the pondcrete disposal in the remediation is also successful, the remaining inventory of saltcrete to be remixed will be comparatively small. For such a small remix job, it would not make sense to disign and build a processing facility if another option were available, such as ship to a treatment facility or utilize another processing train being planned via the Site Treatment Plan. For these reasons, it makes sense to halt the current effort at remix treatability, or redirect it to cover the minimal treatment of pondcrete required prior to disposal in the remediation.

III. REPACK/RESTACK ON 904 PAD

The repack/restack effort for 904 pad was also discussed in lieu of the above direction. In that the pondcrete will go into the remediation, is it still necessary to repack and restack? It was agreed by all that the 904 pad compliance is a regulatory compliance issue and therefore needs to be done without delay, regardless of ultimate fate of the inventoried material. That effort will not then be affected

by the above direction. Any optimization of the repack/restack vis-a-vis the pondcrete under the cap should be implemented provided it does not impact schedule.

IV. PROCUREMENT STRATEGY OF MINIMALLY TREATED SLUDGE/PONDCRETE

EG&G presented their current strategy for executing the design, construction, and start-up/operations for the waste treatment feeding into the remediation. The conceptual design for sludge treatment, including the treatability studies for sludge, are currently under MTS system contract to HNUS. The same scope must be covered for pondcrete. The title II, III, and start-up/operational assistance will be bundled in one subcontract through the A-E MTS vehicle or competitively bid. The construction will be fixed price competitive bid. In this fashion, the onus for ensuring a successful process is with the design firm, which will oversee construction (concurrence to design) as well as start-up and operational assistance. Operation will be done by plant labor.

RFFO suggested that a design-build contract be considered as they feel contractors are easier to hold accountable than design companies. EG&G doesn't feel that the processing trains will be adequately detailed by the conceptual design to enable a design-build fixed price contract. Recent difficulties with the HNUS efforts at characterize/treatability/design/construct/operate contract enhance that concern.

It was agreed that EG&G will consider the RFFO suggestion and discuss with EG&G procurement. Results will be shared with RFFO within six weeks.